

**JOINT SESSION  
COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT  
&  
COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT & REVENUE  
ADMINISTRATION**

**May 5, 2003**

**5:00 PM**

Chairman O’Neil called the meeting to order in joint session with the Committee on Community Improvement.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen O’Neil, Shea, Guinta (late), Smith, Lopez, Thibault

Absent: Alderman Wihby

Messrs: Tom Bowen, Kevin Clougherty, Bob MacKenzie, Ron Johnson

Chairman O’Neil addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Chairman O’Neil advises that the purpose of the joint session is discussion and actions related to bond balances and the FY04 CIP budget.

Chairman O’Neil stated the first item we’re going to do is ask Tom Bowen to come forward just to...Carol is going to try to update us on the status of the Manchester Water Works with the CIP.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated Mr. Chairman, the Water Works currently has a bond resolution for \$44 million that is on the board’s agenda for enrollment tomorrow evening. In the course of looking through that with financial advisors and bond counsel, it was discovered that a portion of that actually needed to be separated out for the water distribution system improvements to the tune of about \$4.5 million. The suggestion is that the Committee would recommend tomorrow evening that the bond resolution be amended to accommodate \$39.5 million for water treatment process improvements and \$4.5 million for the Manchester Water Works distribution system improvements. It will just merely clarify what had originally been intended, as I understand it from Mr. Bowen. In addition, there would be an amending CIP resolution that would need to come forward to establish a water distribution systems improvement project to the tune of \$4.5 million.

Chairman O'Neil asked Bob is there anything else you want to add to that?

Mr. Bowen replied no. That's a very good explanation of a very complicated issue.

Chairman O'Neil asked so it's just a matter of breaking it out into two separate projects?

Mr. Bowen answered that is right. We're not asking to have the number changed, I guess, where the simplest way is we're just taking out a piece of it and defining it as a distribution system improvements, and it's part of the overall financing package that the underwriter had put together.

On a motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted that the bond resolution be amended from \$44 million to \$39.5 to accommodate the water treatment process improvements and \$4.5 million for the Manchester Water Works distribution system improvements.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson stated it's my understanding that the Committee has met in joint session to discuss actions related to bond balances and I believe that Mr. MacKenzie and Mr. Clougherty have been meeting regarding this and have handouts for you and will proceed with some kind of explanations beyond that, I hope.

Bob MacKenzie stated if you could bear with us. We just finished this package about three minutes ago. We would like to kind of walk through what each of these are, but the first one that you see is a listing of projects, this is actually from the Finance Department, that showed all the old projects that we're recommending for a variety of reasons that they just continue on with those projects.

Kevin Clougherty stated just to back up a little bit further, you recall at the last meeting we had a sheet that had all kinds of projects on it and it was kind of confusing for everybody. So what we said is we'll break this out into smaller pieces. The first piece that Bob's talking about are the projects that were on that list originally that we said should not be reallocated, but should be left for the purpose for which it was originally intended, because we have the assurance that those department's are going to spend that money in the next several months. We will be monitoring those projects and getting back to you, but we have a good feeling that they will expend those dollars so there is no reason to reallocate that. That's what this first list is, is the projects that were on the previous list but we're going to leave alone and not ask for any action because they'll be completed on the timetable that we talked about.

Mr. MacKenzie stated unless there are questions on that, you can set aside those two pages.

Chairman O’Neil asked the sheets that total \$1.7 million, is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. The next sheet should be a brighter white sheet that’s portrait versus horizontal. These are all of the bond balances that are recommended to be reallocated and to be used quickly. We did this in the format with numbers that you might have seen that the last time you looked at these. So this particular sheet is formatted by the project where the money’s coming from. If you want to go to the next list, which goes this way with a gray band across the top, this might be a little bit easier. It’s the same information, but it’s sorted by where we’re recommending the funds go to. And if I could Mr. Chairman, I’d just like to walk through that list. The first project on the list is the Rines Building.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the Rines Building is a City project that is going to be expended the most quickly. So we did try to use the oldest bonds, because this will be done before November 1<sup>st</sup>, this project. This project refits the Rines Building, rehabs it. The price tag as Alderman Lopez mentioned at the last meeting has gone up somewhat. We had anticipated it would be \$600,000 and that was what was proposed in the 2004 budget, but it has gone up by roughly \$235,000. I didn’t get a chance, but I do have a listing of all the increases in that project and it ranges from creating an emergency operation center to additional items needed for Health Department, to additional items such as City archives, air conditioning for City archives. But rather than going into that I would prefer to send that list out to the Committee if the two Committee Chairmen don’t mind that. We have a listing of where the additional costs are. So the Rines Building would be \$835,000 and that would be spent in the next six months. The next project Raco Theodore Park, we’re proposing \$80,000 for that after consultation with the Parks & Recreation Department. Again, all of these on this particular sheet are out of bond balances and we can explain if you’d like which project is going to where, but we basically had to match as best we could the majorities of the bonds that we’re dealing with. We typically we have five year bonds, ten year bonds, and twenty year bonds. We had to match those balances with these proposed projects. The next item on the list is school buses, \$100,000. That’s out of a short-term bond balance. I would note that on certain of these, this one included, that the City has bonded this money on the City side of the ledger and we would have to reallocate that debt service from the City side to the school side to do this project. Did I explain that right Kevin?

Mr. Clougherty replied that’s right. In the school district budget that’s before you for next year, they have an amount in there for debt service. Conversely on the City budget for next year there’s an amount for debt service. What we’ll do is we’ll reduce the City side and increase the school district side. It doesn’t affect your bottom line or the taxes you’re just reallocating that over to their side, and that gives them some capacity to meet what we had talked about with the design/build program, the

\$700,000 issues, that gives them some comfort there and some relief. So we're just following up on what we had talked to the board about the other night.

Alderman Lopez stated just so I understand. This is bond balances remaining in the schools that you're talking about?

Mr. Clougherty replied no. What it is, is the bond balances is remaining on the City side. What we're going to do is to transfer it over to the school side so that they have some capacity to do that project and with that we'll follow the funding for it as well.

Alderman Lopez stated there is some skippy money that the school side I think is going to take up tonight. So those bond balances could be used for that and we could use this for something else.

Mr. Clougherty replied no.

Mr. MacKenzie stated if I could Mr. Chairman. The skippy monies only total about \$76,000. We are recommending since they're longer term that those go towards Clem Lemire Field. In this case, this is a short-term project, school buses, so we're using an information, City computer system balance because that's a ten-year bond. Again, we have to keep the bond majorities close to what the proposed project is.

Alderman Lopez stated you came around the other way but that's okay too, as long as we're getting both sides as this point.

Mr. Clougherty replied right. If you look at this one sheet that was handed out Alderman, you'll see that in the project listing it says whether they're five-year, ten-year, twenty-year bonds and whether they're City or school. And you'll see in that far left-hand margin a number; those numbers in that far left-hand margin correspond to the parenthesis numbers in Bob's chart that shows source. We thought that was the easiest way to kind of catwalk between these two things because we weren't just dealing with bonds in some cases.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next two items; the Visitor's Signage Package and InterCity Terminal (MTA) have been in the past cash projects. What we're proposing to do here is that we use short-term bond balances to pay for these two projects. Now really the reason we're doing is that then we can take the cash, as you'll see on the next page when we get there, to use for MER and Police cruisers. But really this is just a vehicle here, these two items, to free up cash to attack a different problem. The next project, Clem Lemire Field, there are five old school projects that have to be used. The bond balances...we would be using all of those five school projects for Clem Lemire Field, which is also school projects, so there would be no change. And small amounts of money in two other projects; Item 8, UNH land acquisition, and riverfront

development, small pieces of those, which would bring the total to \$89,000. Those last two, the small ones, like the school buses, in theory we should reallocate that debt service.

Chairman O’Neil asked the School District has not seen this yet?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no.

Chairman O’Neil asked so we need their recommendation before we do anything?

Mr. Clougherty replied right and that’s the reason for the meeting following, so we can go over with the School, but it at least gives them the feel of how the board is on this. Hopefully we’ll get all the votes we need tonight so it can go to the Aldermanic board tomorrow night.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next one is what we call Building Energy Efficiency Engineering/Feasibility. One of the top priorities of the library was air conditioning of the main library, but there’s other City buildings with issues of air conditioning, heating, that we thought could potentially become an energy efficiency project and we do think rather than funding all of those first, we should determine whether we can find a different way to pay for those through energy efficiencies. We do need some seed money for that project thought, and we’re recommending a freed bond capacity of \$30,000 for that. The next item the senior center, there will be a presentation tomorrow night on it. We are recommending a little over \$300,000 go towards that project.

Alderman Shea asked is that in addition to the \$195,500 Bob? So that’s a total amount of almost \$500,000?

Mr. MacKenzie replied the \$195,000 is already earmarked for the project.

Alderman Shea stated that’s already earmarked and this is in addition to that.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. And lastly on this page, the Notre Dame bridge. We are recommending that a bond balance be used for the Notre Dame bridge, which will free up some additional bonding capacity in next year’s. Of course Notre Dame bridge will be worked on this summer and will happen within the next six month. So that’s a project we can spend quickly.

Mr. Clougherty added the object here is to try and spend the older money first before you reallocate some bonds.

Mr. MacKenzie stated that is all the bond balances per say. You want us to forge on Mr. Chairman to the next...

Chairman O'Neil asked are there any questions on this page.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make sure. In my other notes I was looking at reference to the security bond balance, if you take that, which was 1998, the security bond balances, which was 341898, because I had a conversation at the last meeting that the \$20,000 we have for 2004, and I talked to Red, and there's \$20,000 in there for City Hall, and my question is, did you take that and put it in anything?

Mr. MacKenzie replied no. We did determine at the end that there were contracts actually going to bid in the last couple of weeks where that money was needed to pay for security items.

Alderman Lopez stated so they'll be \$5,000 in the \$20,000 bond next year to look at. Unless you're giving them \$25,000.

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. There were several separate security projects. The one I think you're talking about, did you say number CIP 341898? That one has a balance of \$6,000 and there is really two purposes there. One to help fix the audio system here in the Aldermanic chambers and part of that is to provide additional security here at City Hall.

Alderman Lopez stated I completely understand that. In talking to Red that was all going to be programmed next year in the \$20,000. My question to you, you still go forward with \$20,000 in CIP for 2004, but there's \$6,000 in there that's already been spent by previous bonds, so unless you have other security items that you need it for, that's \$6,000.

Mr. MacKenzie replied possibly, although I would say that the total requests for all security systems for next year was \$500,000 and only \$100,000 was funded. So next year we're not going to have enough money.

Chairman O'Neil stated on page one, Raco Theodore Park, that is for the playground?

Mr. MacKenzie answered that is for the playground, yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked that's enough money to do it?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. Originally we talked about \$75,000, but I believe Ron Johnson indicated...

Ron Johnson stated we've been working with the engineers on the pool project and had them look at this. So we're hoping as soon as this gets approved to put it out to bid, probably in June and get it constructed by mid to late summer.

Alderman Smith stated I'd like to see that in place in June for when the pool opens up. Is there any way to talk to someone like contractors that you are utilizing right now to see if we can expedite this? Because you know we don't have a playground over there.

Mr. Johnson replied one of the key issues would be the playground equipment. It's about a six to eight-week lead-time to order the equipment and get it here. So that's the real critical issue of getting the playground equipment. As soon as we are authorized, we could probably order that separate from the contract itself to do the site work.

Alderman Smith stated because the pool is open and there is softball down there, and no one will be utilizing it in November and December, as you well know. If we're going to have a playground I'd like to have it in the active season.

Mr. Johnson replied we'll do all we can to get it up.

Chairman O'Neil stated separate out the park, get the playground up. The park we can always worry about later, but let's get the playground up. That's what the goal is here.

Mr. MacKenzie stated the next page called Other Recommended Changes, I know we're getting into the final aspects of the 2004 CIP budget, but some of these items were actually related to items that the joint committees have talked about. So I'd like to walk through these. The first one, Hallsville School site issues. There are some serious issues on the site with the retaining wall collapsing and drainage issues that affecting the addition. So we are recommending that...

Alderman Shea asked Mr. Chairman may I comment? I know that Mr. O'Neil reminded me that we need teachers for the schools rather than the design/build, but when we have leaks going into a building and drainage problems I think it's important. And if we have walls falling apart and fences that need to be mended, wouldn't we all agree that that's a necessity?

Chairman O'Neil stated for those with similar in some of the design/build projects Alderman.

Mr. MacKenzie stated I am not going to get in between the two Chairmen, but I will say that we are recommending that that be funded. We did determine for the first time that Hallsville site would be eligible for HUD monies, based upon the new definition. The next item is the Clem Lemire complex. Since we funded the Rines building with

immediate bond balances, we will be able to utilize some monies that were programmed next year for the Rines building. We'll be able to use that towards the Clem Lemire complex. So the total there is \$680,000 in total. If you look on the final sheet, you'll see a quick summary of where we stand with the Clem Lemire project so far. There's been roughly \$75,000 allocated so far and that's been used towards design. There's \$89,000 in immediate bond balances on the previous page and with this new bond change it would be up to \$1.18 million in next year's bonding. So that would be a subtotal of \$1.34 million for the project. We did sit with Parks & Recreation and reviewed the plan. The most logical way to do this would be to do the main phase next. Which is the center field, redoing the track, redoing the field. That total project will be \$2.5 million. We do believe though that we phase the funding...we do the project as one, we go out to bid as one, but we do the project funding phase in two years. So in theory it could start this fall and by the time we get to the next need for additional funding next spring, the board could expedite the funds for the remainder of that phase. I did just want to kind of go over the Clem Lemire Complex. Back to the next sheet again, we've added a couple of other projects that were brought up at hearing, Families in Transition, which didn't get any funding this year but has been funded in the past. We're recommending using their affordable housing trust fund. Police cruisers; the committees did ask us on the ways to fund additional Police cruisers and/or paddy wagons. Second or third on their list is a new paddy wagon. We did find ways basically through swapping money for an additional \$113,000. There is proposed in the operating budget \$120,000 in MER, which isn't necessarily designated towards Police cruisers. So between the two, there'd be \$230,000 for MER.

Alderman Shea stated I know a representative from the Police Department is here, but just a ballpark figure in terms of how many cruisers could be replaced by that figure. Is that something that...?

Mr. MacKenzie replied some of those funds have to go towards basic parts, repairs, but we're probably talking on the order of seven to eight cruisers.

Chairman O'Neil asked combining both sources?

Mr. MacKenzie answered both sources, correct.

Chairman O'Neil stated and that means taking the \$120,000 that's in the operating budget now and it goes exclusively to Police cruisers and no other vehicles in the City.

Mr. MacKenzie stated yes.

Chairman O'Neil asked but out of this we're talking roughly four vehicles? Including a patrol wagon Deputy you were looking for as well?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated I just want to make clear what you said. You're taking \$120,000 and it's going to all Police cruisers, that decision hasn't been made though, right?

Chairman O'Neil replied correct. What we're talking about is the \$113,000 tonight, which will be approximately four vehicles. Probably one transport wagon and three cruisers.

Alderman Guinta asked can you explain to me where exactly this money is coming from again?

Mr. MacKenzie replied you can see in the middle of the page there's a project called signage, one called terminal, and one called signage. The fourth one, CDI, is actually a cash CIP project that we're recommending just be released. There's an old balance on that. But the other three are projects that were recommended that they be bonded. We have bond balances that would pay for these projects and the cash that we had allocated towards those would then apply towards the Police cruisers.

Alderman Guinta asked can you tell me which projects they are? Or do you not know that?

Mr. MacKenzie replied in terms of their numbers?

Alderman Guinta replied yes.

Mr. MacKenzie answered the first one is actually two years applied to visitors signage program. That's basically a way to improve a comprehensive signage package for the City and particularly the downtown.

Alderman Guinta asked how much is in the signage?

Mr. MacKenzie replied there's \$80,000 between the two programs. There's two years worth of basically \$40,000 each.

Alderman Guinta asked so that's money we have not used?

Mr. MacKenzie replied correct.

Alderman Guinta continued did I see signage somewhere else? What is this...and I apologize for not being here but the \$84,000 on page one, where is that coming from?

Mr. MacKenzie replied what we're doing is we're taking some old bond balance projects and paying for those two projects, visitors signage and inner City terminal, with the old bond balances, so that we can free up the cash. So the money for those two, item three is City computer system, part of the City computer system monies and inner City terminal are voting machines and a couple of other projects. Generally small pieces of money. But if you look at the middle where it says source, there's a reference back to a previous page so you can find exactly where those monies are.

Alderman Guinta asked and I'm correct in assuming that unused bonded money has to be allocated to a current or new project. It can't be used for any other use?

Mr. Clougherty replied it can't be used for anything that isn't eligible. In other words it's got to be...you can't bond operating costs. What you have to do is make sure that, and you have to make sure that the bonds that you're reallocating match up with the lives of the bonds that you're transferring funds. So if you have a five-year bond, it's got to go to a five year. It can't go a 20-year bond for something that has a life of five years.

Alderman Guinta asked has there been discussion Mr. Chairman in utilizing unused bonding money to fully fund Cohas Fire Station?

Chairman O'Neil asked for construction or for operating?

Alderman Guinta replied for operating.

Mr. Clougherty stated you can't use bonded money for operating expenses. Cohas is built, I think the compliment of people that you need to operate out there.

Alderman Guinta asked so what happens if Cohas comes in under budget. We can't use that money to operate...

Mr. Clougherty replied you can reallocate that to another 20-year project...another project of 20-year capacity.

Alderman Guinta asked how much money is available that we have either not used or over bonded? What percentage of the tax rate?

Mr. Clougherty replied a lot of these are over multiple years Alderman. But you're talking about our reallocating tonight \$1.5 million over several years.

Alderman Guinta asked which would be how much on the tax rate?

Mr. Clougherty replied what you're not allocating here is...you're allocating the size of the project not the debt service. So you're allocating \$1.5 million worth of projects, not \$1.5 million necessarily worth of debt service in a particular year.

Alderman Guinta asked less debt service per year?

Mr. Clougherty replied yes. This is the total project amount, not the debt service amount. Ordinarily what we say is for every \$1 million there's under \$100,000 in debt service. So you may be talking \$80,000 worth of operating budget impact here.

Alderman Guinta asked but the total is \$1.5 million, which...

Mr. Clougherty interjected over the reallocation period, right.

Alderman Guinta asked do we have any idea of how much that is on the...when compared to our budget?

Mr. Clougherty replied about two cents. Every \$1 million we said is about two cents.

Mr. MacKenzie stated we are getting down to the final pieces. The last item on other recommended changes, is that we do have development impact fee money that's been collected from developers in that portion of the City, that we would use towards the Cohas Fire Station the actual construction. Again that would help release some money that has been used in other locations.

Chairman O'Neil asked you know the Cohas Brook situation off the top of your head, or the Chief's here, I don't know if he knows either? You're saying there may be some bond balances at the end of Cohas Brook Fire Station?

Mr. MacKenzie answered I did check with the Deputy Chief. It's pretty much on schedule, in terms of the construction cost. We are just recommending that the fees that have been collected can now be used toward the actual development of the station. In essence since they're on budget, the \$80,000 you'd put in from development impact fees would free up \$80,000 for other projects and we've reassigned that money to go to the Clem Lemire Complex.

Chairman O'Neil asked but that's not done yet is it?

Mr. MacKenzie replied it's shown here as a recommended action. If you look up under Clem Lemire Complex, under source, there's two notes there. One bond capacity created by bond balances funding Rines and also \$80,000 from CIP 411403. That's the Cohas station.

Chairman O'Neil asked so that's in that \$680,000 number?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes. That is all the items. We did just put on the two multi-year funded projects, Clem Lemire Complex and Senior Center just so you can see where those two projects stood with these reallocations.

Alderman Shea asked Bob or Sam, does this conclude...we hear the word closure now all the time, is this closure for all of the past bondings that we have, or are there somewhat limited amounts necessary in the event that Mr. Gatsas comes in and wants something for Derryfield Park or somebody wants something for something else? Is it all concluded now, or is there any money that remains that we don't know about that maybe you folks know about that we should know about in order to discuss it with someone else?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I do want to mention a couple of things. One is that, one of the bonds we have not sold yet is the re-evaluation, and we used some of that money towards one of these projects, but there is roughly \$50,000 that has not been reassigned. Also, where did we put the intersection money into the Notre Dame Bridge?

Alderman Shea stated I'm more interested in the bottom line. How much is left.

Mr. MacKenzie answered should we count in the new offer from Verizon? If the board accepts an offer that's being made by Verizon to help pay for the Notre Dame Bridge, we would be at about roughly another \$140,000 of future bonding capacity that we could have.

Chairman O'Neil asked Bob could you just put that, because I'm sure we're all going to keep this paperwork...could you put that this is a note to us. Just as you explained it to Alderman Shea.

Mr. MacKenzie answered sure.

Mr. Clougherty stated just one point Alderman, you will continue to get, as you have been getting, those reports from our office on all of the bond balances. It's my understanding that those reports will go to the CIP Committee as well, so we'll be monitoring this ongoing. As these projects get older each year, they'll be not so much around this year, but next year, you'll take the three oldest years and we'll go through the process routinely to try and make sure that the programs are spending the money in the time constraints of the IRS.

Alderman Thibault asked I'm not sure who can answer this but there was a figure that we gave Verizon as to what we felt their responsibility was. How does that match to this figure that they're proposing now?

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the Solicitor's office is probably going to have to answer that because I don't have the answer to that.

Alderman Smith stated I'm looking down the list and I imagine everything's coming from the riverfront development, is that correct? For the Rines building and for the Senior Center?

Mr. MacKenzie responded the largest bond balances were from two riverfront projects.

Alderman Smith stated if I'm looking at this correctly, one was 1999 and one was the year 2000, is that correct?

Mr. MacKenzie replied yes.

Alderman Lopez stated you mentioned a couple of sources of funds, there are two others. The revolving account...is any of this from the revolving account that can be used in any portion of what we're talking about to release any money?

Mr. MacKenzie answered there were two revolving accounts and one economic development fund. I know they have been discussed and just so you know what those are. There's a Central Business District Revitalization Fund, which is a revolving fund. There is the AirPark Economic Development Fund, and there's a revolving business loan fund that MEDO operates.

Alderman Lopez asked could you, as the Chairman said, when you give us those notes, could you give us the data on those accounts and what they can be used for, so we can be brought up to date. I do want to thank the Committee because you've worked on this. This is my fourth year, and I hope that the Finance officer and Planning Division come up with some type of policy that they can bring before the board so that these people who get bonds, we can closely watch them instead of having to go through hours and hours like we have in the past couple of years.

On a motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to approve the transfer of funds to uses as outlined.

Chairman O'Neil asked what is the proper action leaving the joint committee? And I should probably turn behind me.

Mr. MacKenzie replied I think the Committee on Accounts deals with the balances and maybe they could concur with releasing the bond balances as recommended and the CIP Committee reallocates.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson replied no. Typically the Committee on Community Improvement is usually the one that makes the recommendations, however, because it was initiated out of accounts, we had asked that both committees meet in joint session, and I think a joint report of the committees will be acceptable for board purposes, and all other policy purposes. My suggestion would be I guess that the motion be to accept the recommendations presented, which include transfers of funds, include creation of new projects, both in the 2003 and 2004 CIPs to produce resolutions as required as a result of this along with recommendations of changing resolutions. And in the instance of all the school projects, we would also...that would be subject to the approval of the Joint School Buildings Committee. So if you wanted to move forward with that then you can bring forth the rest.

Alderman Lopez moved, with a second by Alderman Thibault, to accept the recommendations as presented including transfer of funds, creation of new projects, both in the 2003 and 2004 CIPs, produce resolutions as required, along with recommendations of changing resolutions. In addition, all school projects would be subject to the approval of the Joint School Buildings Committee.

Chairman O'Neil stated and that will go to the Joint School Committee.

Deputy City Clerk Johnson interjected the school projects will go to the Joint School Committee immediately following this, and we will submit a report from all of the committees to the board directly tomorrow night with the appropriate resolutions and changes.

Chairman O'Neil called the question and the motion was approved with Alderman Guinta in opposition.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on a motion of Alderman Smith, duly seconded by Alderman Shea, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee